

**REMARKS**

**Summary of the Office Action**

Claims 1-7 and 18-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Payne (US 5,420,779) in view of Ito et al. (US 2002/0021097).

Claims 9-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Payne in view of Ito et al. and Lin et al. (US 2003/0001524).

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the indication that claims 8 and 17 contain allowable subject matter.

**Summary of the Response to the Office Action**

Applicants amend claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 18-22, and 24 to further define the invention. Accordingly, claims 1-24 are pending for consideration.

**All Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter**

Claims 1-7 and 18-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Payne (US 5,420,779) in view of Ito et al. (US 2002/0021097), and claims 9-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Payne in view of Ito et al. and Lin et al. (US 2003/0001524). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections as being based upon references that neither teach nor suggest the combination of features recited by independent claims 1, 9, and 18, and hence dependent claims 2-8, 10-17 and 19-24.

Independent claim 1, as amended, recites an inverter device for a liquid crystal display including, in part, “a low path switching part selectively connecting low paths of the plurality of backlight lamps with a ground voltage source in response to an external inverter ON/OFF signal,” and “a shutdown circuit for receiving a voltage input through the low paths of the plurality of backlight lamps to monitor for a malfunction of the one of the plurality of

backlight lamps in response to an external shutdown ON/OFF signal.” Similarly, independent claim 18, as amended, recites a method for monitoring backlight lamps of a liquid crystal display including, in part, steps of “selectively connecting a low path of each of the backlight lamps with a ground voltage source in response to an external inverter ON/OFF signal,” and “receiving a voltage input through the low path of the one of the backlight lamps to monitor for a malfunction of the one of the backlight lamps in response to an external shutdown ON/OFF signal.”

In contrast to Applicants’ claimed invention, Payne is completely silent with regard to an inverter device that selectively connects low paths of the plurality of backlight lamps with a ground voltage source in response to an external inverter ON/OFF signal, as require by amended independent claims 1 and 18. In further contrast to Applicants’ claimed invention, Payne is completely silent with regard to an inverter device that receives a voltage input through the low paths of the plurality of backlight lamps to monitor for a malfunction of the one of the plurality of backlight lamps in response to an external shutdown ON/OFF signal.

In addition, Applicants respectfully assert that Ito et al. and Lin et al., whether taken singly or combined, fails to remedy these deficiencies of Payne since both Ito et al. and Lin et al. likewise fails to teach or suggest selectively connecting low paths of the plurality of backlight lamps with a ground voltage source in response to an external inverter ON/OFF signal, and receiving a voltage input through the low paths of the plurality of backlight lamps to monitor for a malfunction of the one of the plurality of backlight lamps in response to an external shutdown ON/OFF signal.

With regard to independent claim 9, Applicants respectfully assert that the Office Action has failed to properly examine the combination of features recited by at least independent claim 9. For example, independent claim 9, as originally-filed, explicitly recites “a plurality of backlight lamps,” “a plurality of inverters, each receiving an inverter drive voltage, converting the received drive voltage into an AC lamp drive voltage, and supplying the AC lamp drive voltage to a high path of each of the backlight lamps,” wherein “the inverters selectively connect a low path of each of the backlight lamps with a ground voltage source in response to an external inverter ON/OFF signal, and the inverters receive a voltage input through the low path of the backlight lamp to perform a shutdown function for monitoring for the presence or absence of a malfunction of the backlight lamp in response to an external shutdown ON/OFF signal.” In the Office Action, the “plurality of backlight lamps” are completely not addressed, nor are the “plurality of inverters.” Moreover, the Office Action fails to address the relationship reciting “the inverters selectively connect a low path of each of the backlight lamps with a ground voltage source in response to an external inverter ON/OFF signal, and the inverters receive a voltage input through the low path of the backlight lamp to perform a shutdown function for monitoring for the presence or absence of a malfunction of the backlight lamp in response to an external shutdown ON/OFF signal.”

In addition, Applicants respectfully assert that Payne, Ito et al., and Lin et al., whether taken singly or combined, teach or suggest the combination of features recited by at least independent claim 9, for at least the reasons detailed above. Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that the Office Action fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness with regard to at least independent claim 9, and hence dependent claims 10-17.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully assert that the dismissal of Applicants' invention recited by claims 10-16 is improper. For example, the scope of claim 1 is completely different than the scope of claim 9. Accordingly, simply alleging that claims 10-16 may be rejected "under the same rationale" as claims 1-7, respectively, is illogical and incorrect. Specifically, although claim 1 and 10, for example, may recite similar features, claims 1 and 10 do not have the same scope since claim 10 also includes the features of independent claim 9. Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that the Office Action has failed to properly examine Applicants' claimed invention.

For at least the above reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 9, and 18 are neither taught nor suggested by Payne and/or Lin et al., whether taken alone or in combination. Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be withdrawn because the above-discussed novel combination of features are neither taught nor suggested by any of the applied references, whether taken singly or combined.

### **CONCLUSION**


In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request entry of the above amendments, reconsideration, and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner believe that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this Response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS**

By: \_\_\_\_\_



David B. Hardy  
Reg. No. 47,362

Date: April 21, 2006

**Customer No. 09629**  
**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS**  
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20004  
Telephone: 202-739-3000